



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

undetermined by what he thinks ought to have been true of Jesus' messianic self-estimate. Further attention should be called to his general treatment regarding the relation of Mark and Paulinism. It is his historical recognition that Paul was dependent upon Jesus rather than Jesus (in the synoptic picture) upon Paul that sounds the note of sane historical criticism. There have been many impossible things written upon the synoptists' dependence upon Paulinism, which never would have been written had our critics been better historians and more thoroughly read in the messianic views of the day. Both in the case of Jesus and in the case of Paul the schema of thought is the same, and the emphasis upon this common material as that which is inherited by Jesus and Paul alike is one of the important contributions which Feine has made to the study of New Testament history. The reading of Feine's book will go far to establish a balance in theological method, which has been seriously threatened by theories of knowledge.

SHAILER MATHEWS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BOOKS ON NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION

Professor Jülicher's "Introduction to the New Testament" was first published in 1894; the third and fourth editions appeared in 1901, and now, after five years, come the fifth and sixth.¹ The revision has been thoroughgoing, extending to all parts of the work. The original 404 pages have grown to 581, and of these about 80 represent the last increase. In expressing his regret at the expansion, Jülicher explains that it was unavoidable if he was to give a fresh statement of present-day conclusions rather than a revised presentation of the situation eleven years ago.

The general plan of the book remains unchanged, but within this framework there are important modifications. The sections where this is most noticeable are those dealing with the gospels, particularly the Synoptic Gospels. Wellhausen's "Introduction to the First Three Gospels"² appeared just as Jülicher was engaged in carrying his own book through the press. He felt in duty bound to delay publication until he could take account of this very important contribution to the discussion of the synoptic problem. The conclusions of Wellhausen have not led Jülicher to modify his main positions, but they have influenced his whole presentation. He holds that among the earliest of the gospel-like writings

¹ *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Von Adolf Jülicher. Fünfte und sechste neu bearbeitete Auflage. Tübingen: Mohr, 581 pages. M. 9.

² *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1905.

to come into existence was one in Aramaic, made up mainly, though not exclusively, of sayings of Jesus. This is often called the "Logia source," and by Wellhausen is designated as Q. It was gradually developed from a collection of loosely connected sayings into something resembling a gospel. In its original Aramaic form it is older than Mark, but in its Greek translation, as used by Matthew and Luke, it contained parts that are later than Mark. Jülicher is thus enabled to admit that Wellhausen has made it extremely probable that the Logia source (or Q) of Matthew and Luke is post-Markan, and still hold that in origin it is older. A dependence, however, of the Logia on Mark cannot be proved, though some influence may have been exercised by that gospel in the process of the Logia development. We have too little knowledge of this source to attempt to determine its probable plan and extent, or to distinguish the later additions from the original composition. It may well go back in its earliest beginnings to the apostle Matthew, but in its later form it is certainly post-apostolic.

Professor Jülicher is as averse as ever to postulating a primitive Mark. He finds other ways that seem to him preferable for explaining the difficulties that are disposed of by this hypothesis. He rejects the assumption that the writer of Mark sought to incorporate into his gospel all the information at his disposal regarding the words and deeds of Jesus. Only that was used, rather, which seemed to set forth the kingly, the irresistible, the divine in the world's Redeemer. He is of the opinion that the Aramaic origin of most of the synoptic material and the existence of written Aramaic sources has been established by Wellhausen, but he does not think that it has been shown that in our Mark a translator speaks who is a different person from the Aramaic author. Nor would he agree in regarding Mark as our one reliable source for the life of Jesus. Matthew and Luke belong at the close of the period when old sources were still available. They were composed much after the manner of Mark and with much the same purpose. With reference to the two kinds of material, narrative and discourse, Jülicher regards it as incorrect to make the discourse material so entirely secondary as Wellhausen does. More additions may have been made in the course of time to the words than to the deeds, and in so far the historical narrative would deserve precedence; but, on the other hand, the words were at first transmitted with more care, because what the Lord had said was regarded as authoritative. Too much importance ought not to be given to literary attestation.

Aside from the Synoptic Gospels, the new revision shows most noticeable changes in dealing with the Fourth Gospel, but without essential

modifications of main conclusions. Of recent discussions of the Johannine question, that of E. Schwartz³ receives most consideration. External evidence for Johannine authorship is considered to be practically valueless. Papias is the first to give such testimony, but he also states that John, as well as his brother James, suffered a martyr's death. This could have taken place only in Palestine. The witness of Irenaeus and Polycrates to the Ephesian origin of the gospel cannot stand before the silence of the earlier Fathers, Ignatius and Polycarp. The tradition of the apostle's residence at Ephesus arose from confusing him with the John to whom Papias gives the title of Elder. This last-named John may well have been the author of the Apocalypse, but if so, he could not have written the gospel, since hardly any other conclusion is so certain as that the same author did not produce both works. Internal evidence shows that the author of the gospel was not an eyewitness of the events that he relates. He was an unknown Christian resident in Syria, who in the second century wrote to defend Christianity against objections arising directly or indirectly from Jewish unbelief. Considerable space is given to refuting the theory of Schwartz that chap. 21 is an addition of Asian and probably Ephesian origin. Jülicher holds that the chapter is by the same author as the rest of the book, though it was possibly added subsequently, in response to a demand on the part of the readers for a more definite indication of the person of the loved disciple.

The list of the genuinely Pauline letters remains the same. The investigations of W. Wrede⁴ and G. Hollmann⁵ regarding the genuineness of II Thessalonians have received attention, but the possibility of Pauline authorship for the letter is still affirmed. The South Galatian theory has made no appreciable progress in Jülicher's favor in the last five years. An undue importance seems to him to have been given to the discussion of this question. The analysis of II Corinthians by A. Halmel⁶ meets with as little approval as previous attempts to solve the Corinthian problem by a like method. The difficulties that beset the assumption that II Cor., chaps. 10-13, is a distinct letter, either the one alluded to in the earlier chapters or a fifth one, written after chaps. 1-9, are met by Halmel in maintaining that chaps. 10-13 follow as well as precede chaps. 1-9.

³ *Ueber den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Johannes-evangeliums*, 1904.

⁴ *Die Echtheit des 2. Thessalonicherbriefs untersucht*, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N. F., Vol. IX, No. 2, 1903.

⁵ *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. V, (1904) pp. 28 ff.

⁶ *Der 2. Korintherbrief des Apostels Paulus*, 1904.

That is, he analyzes what remains of this last-named section after he has excised 6:14—7:1 as an interpolation and 3:12-18; 4:3-43 as redactional additions of ancient liturgical phrases, into two letters, a fourth and a sixth. This feat of critical ingenuity, notwithstanding its brilliancy, has but confirmed Jülicher's opinion that chaps. 10-13 were written at the same time with chaps. 1-9. Change of tone and bearing and broken connections need not disturb us, considering our very imperfect knowledge of the circumstances that called forth the letter and attended its writing. The conclusion of the section on Ephesians has been so recast as to make Pauline authorship seem more questionable. But the difficulties in the way of this view are affirmed to be hardly greater than those encountered by the hypothesis of post-Pauline origin.

The importance which Jülicher attaches to the second and third parts of his "Introduction," "History of the Canon and History of the Text," is made evident by the careful revision, which is no less apparent here than in the preceding special "Introduction." Results are the same, making clear "the incontestable fact of the gradual and human origin of the Canon." He finds little progress to be noted in text-criticism. There continues to be wide divergence of view in fundamental matters. The rejection of the *Textus Receptus* is still the one important point of agreement. The hope for advance lies, not in a grand reconstruction, but in careful laborious investigation of the ancient versions and church fathers. Dogmatic prejudices and desires have unfortunately a decisive influence in the handling of inner evidence. Wellhausen has shown that the history of the text of the gospels during the first two centuries is in reality a section of the history of the church's conception of Christianity. It is time to recognize more fully that reasonable conjectural emendation has its rightful place, when other means of establishing the text are wanting. The advice of Blass that the critic should strive to find a witness of some kind supporting his conjecture does not meet approval.

It is to be hoped that the English translation of Professor Jülicher's "Introduction" will also be soon revised and brought up to date. We have in English no recent work of such wide and careful scholarship, presenting in such a candid way what can be claimed as results and what are still to be regarded as problems in the field of New Testament introduction. One does not need to accord throughout with the judgment of Jülicher in order to appreciate his broad-mindedness and sound common-sense. There is no doubt that his one aim has been to produce a scientific textbook that shall help in the search for truth. His style and choice of material are determined by this purpose.

Of all sections, the treatment of the Johannine question remains as before perhaps the least satisfactory. It is difficult to feel that the weight of external evidence has been adequately valued. In spite of recent investigations, this continues to be of first importance in reaching conclusions as to authorship. So, too, the author's estimate of the historical value of the Fourth Gospel will still provoke wide dissent.

Professor von Soden, of Berlin, has recently published a brief treatise devoted to special introduction.⁷ It has been well translated, or rather paraphrased, by Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, M.A., and appears as Vol. XIII of the "Crown Theological Library."⁸ It is more popular in character than the work just considered, aiming to present conclusions in a readable form rather than to furnish a discussion of problems. In fact, it is the almost entire disappearance of many problems that impresses one who turns to this book after reading Professor Jülicher; and one can hardly repress the wish that as many things were definitely settled as here seem to be.

Aside from a preliminary survey of 20 pages, and appendix of 14 pages devoted to the epistles of James, Jude, and II Peter, there are four main divisions: I, "Paul," pp. 21-120; II, "The Gospel Literature," pp. 121-200; III, "The Post-Pauline Literature," pp. 201-333; IV, "The Johannine Literature," pp. 334-462. In the Pauline section it is said to be most highly probable that the letter referred to in II Cor. 2:4 ff., has come down to us in chaps. 10-13. Rom. 16:1-20 is considered by itself under the heading "A Supposed Epistle to the Ephesians." It is thought that this may have been a short epistle prepared for the use of Phoebe wheresoever she might travel in Asia. Colossians is held to be Pauline, save for 1:15-20, which is a later expansion. Ephesians, the Pastorals and II Thessalonians are assigned to the post-Pauline literature. Tychicus is suggested as a possible author of Ephesians. If not by him, it is by some disciple of Paul, of lofty, far-seeing, and rich spirit, who may have heard his master express "similar thoughts concerning the unifying power of Christianity without, of course, making them the central point in the gospel, as happens in this epistle." In another passage we are told that the Catholic church "has learned and borrowed more from this epistle than from all the writings of Paul taken together." A Pauline

⁷ *Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte (die Schriften des Neuen Testaments)*. Von Hermann Frhr. von Soden. 1905. 237 pages.

⁸ *The History of Early Christian Literature: The Writings of the New Testament*, by Baron Hermann von Soden. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. Edited by W. D. Morrison. New York: Putnam's; London: Williams & Norgate, 1906. 476 pages.

kernel is found in Titus and II Timothy. The redactor of these two letters, who is also the author of I Timothy, was closely related in his ideas to the writers of Ephesians and Acts.

The two-source theory is accepted for the Synoptic Gospels. A sketch of the probable contents of the Logia is given on the basis of Luke, who has best preserved its order. The primitive Mark was based on the reminiscences of Peter, and was written in Rome shortly after the apostle's death in 64 A. D. The writer of our canonical Mark was probably acquainted with the Logia. His plan of writing is sketched, and the additions attributable to his pen are noted.

The post-Pauline literature, which, beside the works referred to, includes Acts, Hebrews, and I Peter, is thought to belong to the last decade of the first century. An attempt is made to separate the "we"-document of Acts from its "wrapping of oral tradition," and a part of what results from this effort is printed as a consecutive narrative (pp. 112 f.; Eng. pp. 240 f.). In historical value this is regarded as hardly inferior to Paul's epistles. The Epistle to the Hebrews is thought to have been written to gentile Christians in Rome and other Italian churches.

The Johannine writings are likened to a group of buildings belonging to the same school of architecture. The Apocalypse is based on a Jewish apocalypse written at Jerusalem between May and August, 70 A. D. The sections attributable to this source in 8:1-22:5 are indicated. The Fourth Gospel is a "doctrinal textbook in historical vesture." The discourses are addressed to the readers, and not to those who on each occasion are supposed to have heard them. The writer was a prophet, who was conscious that he was not reporting historical fact as a chronicler would record it, but was nevertheless assured that he was giving to men its abiding, eternal significance. There is nothing in the gospel to indicate that the evangelist regarded the Beloved Disciple, of whom he was a devoted adherent, as John, the son of Zebedee. If we assume that he was rather John, the famous elder of Ephesus, who might have been a native of Jerusalem and for a time a personal disciple of Jesus, we have a satisfactory explanation of the tradition of Johannine authorship and of the phenomena of the gospel.

James, Jude, and II Peter are relegated to an appendix, because in time and content they lie outside primitive Christian development and contribute nothing essential to our knowledge of the same.

In method of investigation, as well as in many conclusions, Professor von Soden is in accord with Professor Jülicher. One marked difference, however, is noticeable—the readiness with which he employs literary

analysis and the confidence which he places in the results. Because of the large number of readers who will not discriminate, one can but feel that what is generally conceded should be more sharply distinguished from personal opinion and from what is widely questioned. Jülicher's "Introduction," though less popular in character, will none the less be more serviceable, even to the general reader. There is much in von Soden's book that is stimulating and suggestive, but oftentimes it is difficult to recognize the reasonableness or advantage of his hypotheses. For instance, if the Epistle to the Ephesians has such near relationship to Paul, why not make the connection a little closer? Or again cannot most of the objections based on internal grounds, and many of those on external, still be urged against this hypothesis of a double of the apostle John? Other questions of a like import will suggest themselves to the thoughtful reader.

WARREN J. MOULTON

BANGOR, ME.

SOME RECENT WORKS ON PAUL AND PAULINISM

The half-dozen books which are to be considered in this article cover a pretty wide field. Nägeli's¹ pamphlet of 100 pages is an introductory characterization of the Pauline vocabulary. It makes abundant references to the inscriptions and papyrus fragments discovered in recent years. The author regards the *κοινή* as a natural development from the classical Greek, a connecting link between that and the new language. The letters attributed to Paul share throughout the character of the *κοινή*. The apostle was uninfluenced by the literary theories of his day. His vocabulary is not only largely post-classical, but it bears another mark of the *κοινή*, viz., its giving new meanings to old words. This vocabulary represents both grades of the *κοινή*, its more select diction being found in I Corinthians, Philippians, and Romans; its more common forms, in Galatians and Philemon.

Nägeli suggests, and with force, that too much has been said of Hebraisms in Paul's writings. Most of the expressions thus denominated are from the LXX, and are to be attributed to the influence of this Greek version rather than to a Semitic mode of thought on Paul's part.

In regard to the bearing of the lexical argument on the question of genuineness the view of Nägeli is cautious and moderate. He finds the four chief letters bound together by vocabulary and mode of expression.

¹ *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*. Von Theodor Nägeli. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905. 100 pages. M. 2.80.